The Elamite Version of the Record of Darius's Palace at Susa

Walther Hinz

THE ELAMITE VERSION OF THE RECORD OF
DARIUS'S PALACE AT SUSA

WALTHER HINZ

THE trilingual inscription of Darius I (522–486) recording the building of his palace at Susa must be reckoned among the most important documents contributing to our knowledge of the history of ancient civilization. In spite of numerous efforts, no final edition of this inscription giving all three versions (Old Persian, Elamite, and Akkadian), has been achieved so far. To R. G. Kent we owe the best available *Old Persian* version of DS*f*, pending the publication of his Old Persian volume.[1]

The *Elamite* version of DS*f* has been dealt with by the following scholars: V. Scheil published the texts;[2] his reconstructions and translations are not, however, always felicitous. F. W. König,[3] F. H. Weissbach,[4] and W. Brandenstein[5] all based their work only on the fragments *a–i*, which were all that was available at the time (1929). Thus large gaps in the Elamite inscription were inevitable. E. Herzfeld,[6] it is true, utilized the additional fragments *j* and *k* published in 1933, but he confined his studies to lines 20–51 of DS*f*. Moreover, he gave only a moderate number of reconstructions, and these do not in all cases seem to hit the mark.

I shall now present a totally revised Elamite version of DS*f* utilizing all the existing fragments of the inscription. With the exception of only a few passages, the text may now be considered complete.

---

[1] "The Record of Darius's Palace at Susa," *JAOS*, LIII (1933), 1–23, with additions *JAOS*, LIV (1934), 34–40.

[2] Fragments *a—i* in *Mémoires de la Mission Archéologique de Perse*, Vol. XXI (Paris, 1929), Pls. IV, V, VI, and VII. Fragments *j–k*, *op. cit.*, Vol. XXIV (Paris, 1933), Pls. III and IV. Fragment *l*, *op. cit.*, XXVIII (Paris, 1939), 33. Fragment *m* (so-called "*fragment de barillet*"), in *Mémoires de la Délégation en Perse*, XI (Paris, 1910), 87.

[3] *Der Burgbau zu Susa nach dem Bauberichte des Königs Dareios I.*, *MVAeG*, XXXV, No. 1 (Leipzig, 1930), 76 pp.

[4] Review of V. Scheil, *Inscriptions des Achéménides à Suse*, *MMAP*, Vol. XXI, and of the study by F. W. König mentioned under n. 3, *AfO*, VII (1931/32), 37–45. F. H. Weissbach was the first to discover that fragment *m*, published as early as 1910, formed part of DS*f*.

[5] "Die neuen Achämenideninschriften," *WZKM*, XXXIX (Wien, 1932). DS*f* is treated there on pp. 28–38.

[6] *Altpersische Inschriften* (Berlin, 1938), pp. 13–17.

1

<div align="center">

TRANSLITERATION

</div>

<div align="right">

Number of
Sign Units[7]

</div>

1	§ 1 [ᴰᴵᴺᴳᴵᴿ *na-ap.ir-šá-ir-ra*] ᴰᴵᴺᴳᴵᴿ *u-ra-maš-da ak-ka₄* ⊢*mu-ru-un hi be-[i]š-da ak-ka₄*	23½
2	[ᴰᴵᴺᴳᴵᴿ*ki-ik hu-b]e be-iš-da ak-ka₄* ⏉ᴿᵁᴴᴹᴱˢ *be-i[š-d]a ak-ka₄ ši-ia-ti-um be-*	22½
3	[*-iš-d]a* ⏉ᴿᵁᴴᴹᴱˢ*-ir-ra.na ak-ka₄*⏉*da-ri-ia-ma-u-iš* ⏉*sunku-ir hu-*	19½
4	[*-ut-taš-da ki-[ir ir-še-ik-ki-ip.na* ⏉*sunku ki-ir ir-še-ki-ip.na te-nu-*	21½
5	[*-um-da-ut-ti-ra.* § 2 ⏉]*ú* ⏉*da-ri-i[a]-ma-u-iš* ⏉*sunku-ir-šá-ir-ra* ⏉*sunku* ⏉*sunku-*	21½
6	[*-ip-ir-ra* ⏉*sunku* ⏉]*da-a-[ia-u-iš]-be.na* ⏉*sunku* ⊢*mu-ru-un hi uk-ku.ra* ⏉	21½
7	[*mi-iš-da-áš-ba šá-ak]-ri* ⏉*ha-ak-ka₄-man-nu-ši-ia* § 3 *a-ak* ⏉*da-ri-ia-ma-*	22½
8	[*-u-iš* ⏉*sunku na-an-r]i* ᴰᴵᴺᴳᴵᴿ*u-ra-maš-da ak-ka₄ ir-šá-ir* ᴰᴵᴺᴳᴵᴿ*na-ap-be.ra hu-*	22½
9	*-pír-ri* [⏉]*ú-um be-šá hu-pír-ri* ⏉*sunku* ⏉*ú-na-un-ku hu-ut-taš hu-pír-*	20½
10	*-ri* ⏉*sunku-um-me* [⏉*d]u-nu-iš ap-pa ir-šá-an-na ap-pa* ᴬᴺˢᵁ.ᴷᵁᴿ.ᴿᴬ	22
11	ᴹᴱˢ [⏉]ᴿᵁᴴᴹᴱˢ.*e* [*ši-iš-n]i-na* § 4 *ṣa-u-mi-in* ᴰᴵᴺᴳᴵᴿ*u-ra-maš-da.na ak-ka₄*	20½
12	[⏉]*ú* [⏉]*ad-da-da* [⏉*mi-iš-da-áš-ba ku-]ud-da* ⏉*ir-šá-ma ak-ka₄* ⏉*ú* ⏉*si-*	22
13	*-ip-ri hu-[pi-be ka₄-tuk-be sa-ap ap-pa]* *an-ka₄* ᴰᴵᴺᴳᴵᴿ*u-ra-maš-da* ⏉*ú* ⏉*sunku*	22
14	[⏉*ú-na-un-ku hu-ut-taš* ⊢*mu]-ru-un hi uk-ku a-ak* ᴰᴵᴺᴳᴵᴿ*u-ra-maš-da*	21
15	[*hi ši-la ha-ni-iš* ⊢*mu-ru-u]n hi ki-ir-ma-ka₄ uk-ku* ⏉ᴿᵁᴴᴹᴱˢ*-ir-ra* ⏉	21½
16	[*ú-un u-ri-iš-da (?)* ⏉*sunku* ⏉]*ú-na-un-ku hu-ut-taš* ⊢*mu-ru-un hi uk-*	20½?
17	[*-ku* ⏉*ú* ᴰᴵᴺᴳᴵᴿ*u-ra-maš-da . . . -m]e hi du-nu* ᴰᴵᴺᴳᴵᴿ*u-ra-maš-da pi-ik-ti* ⏉*ú da-*	23 ?
18	[*-iš ap-pa* ⏉*ú ti-r]u-un-ka₄ hu-be ú-ṣa-ra-um-mi hu-ut-taš ap-pa* ⏉	21
19	[*ú hu-ud-da mar-ri]-da ṣa-u-mi-in* ᴰᴵᴺᴳᴵᴿ*u-ra-maš-da.na* ⏉*ú hu-ud-da* § 5 *a-ak*	23½
20	[*hi* ⊢ᵁᴸ.ᴴᴵᴹᴱˢ *ap-pa* ⊢]*šu-šá-an hu-ud-da-ra* ⊢*[t]e-tin.ni ku-[ti-ik-ka₄]* ᴷᴵ.ᴹᴵᴺ	23½
21	[*šá-da-ni-ka₄.ma.mar (?) . . . .-]ak.na šá-ra.ma* ⊢*mu-ru-un máṣ-šik ku-iš [b]e-la-ka₄*	23½?
22	*sa-ap* ⊢*mu-ru-un máṣ-šik-ka₄ tar-ma-ak me-n[i* ⊢*si-ka₄-]um ṣik-kak m[u-u]r* XL	22
23	[*ú*ᴹᴱˢ *mu-ur* XX *ú*ᴹᴱˢ] *maš-kar-ni* ⊢*si-ka₄ hu-be* [*uk-ku* ⊢ᵁᴸ.ᴴᴵᴹᴱˢ *ṣik-kak a-*	23
24	[*-ak] ap-pa* ⊢*mu-ru-un máṣ-sik-ka₄ du-[ru-ma-ak (?) ku-u]d-da ap-pa* [⊢ *si-ka₄-*	21 ?
25	*-ha ṣik-kak-ka₄ ku-ud-da ap-pa* ⊢*i[-iš-ti-iš hu-ut-tuk-ka₄* ⏉*ta]š-šu-íb [ap-pa]*	23
26	⏉*ba-pi-li-ip hu-pi-be hu-ut-taš* § 6 *a-ak* ᴳᴵˢ*te-tin ap-[pa na-u-]*	19½
27	*-iṣ-in-na hu-be* ⊢*la-ba-na-na hi-še* ⊢ᴷᵁᴿᴹᴱˢ *hu-be.ma.mar tin-[g]i-ik* ⏉	21½
28	[*taš-šu-íb] ap-pa* ⏉*áš-šu-ra-ap hu-pi-be ku-ti-iš ku-iš* ⊢*b[a-p]i-li a-*	22
29	[*-ak* ⊢*ba-pi-l]i.mar* ⏉*kur-ka₄-ap a-ak* ⏉*ia-u-na-ap ku-ti-iš ku-iš* ⊢	21
30	[*šu-šá-an* ᴳᴵˢ]*še-iš-šá-ba-ut* ⊢*kán-da-ra.mar tin-gi-ik ku-ud-da* ⊢	20
31	[*kur-ma-an-na.ma]r* ⊢*la-áš-da* ⊢*iš-ba[r]-d[a].mar ku-ud-da* ⊢*ba-ak-tar.*	19½
32	[*-mar tin-gi-ik] ap-pa hi.ma hu-ut-tuk a-ak* ⊢*ka₄-si-ka₄ ap-pa ka₄-ba-u-*	21½
33	[*-da-ka₄ ku-ud-da* ⊢]*ši-in-ka₄-ab-ru-iš ap-pa hi.ma hu-[ut-tuk-ka₄] hu-be* ⊢	22
34	[*šu-ug-da.mar tin-gi-]ik a-ak* ⊢*ka₄-si-ka₄ ap-pa ak-še-[na hu-be* ⊢ *m]a-r[a-]*	22
35	[*-iš-mi-iš.mar tin-]gi-ik ap-pa hi.ma hu-ut-tuk-ka₄ a[-ak* ⊢ ᴷᵁ̀.]ᴮᴬᴮᴮᴬᴿ	20½
36	[ᴹᴱˢ *ku-ud-da* ᴳᴵˢ. . . . ⊢*mu]-iṣ-ra.mar tin-gi-ik a-ak* ⊢*[te-tin da-u]n-na*	22 ?
37	[*. . -šu (?)* ⊢ᵁᴸ.ᴴᴵᴹᴱˢ*.na (?) kar-s]u-ka₄ hu-be* ⊢*ia-u-na.mar tin-gi-[ik a-a]k* ᴳᴵˢ	22 ?
38	[*ni-hi*ᴹᴱˢ *(?) ap-pa hi.ma h]u-ut-tuk-ka₄* ⊢*ku-šá.mar ku-ud-da* ⊢*hi-in-du-iš.*	22 ?
39	[*-mar ku-ud-da* ⊢*har-ru-ma-]ut-ti-iš.mar tin-gi-ik a-ak* ⊢*e-ul-lat* ⊢ᴴᴬᴿ	21½
40	[ᴹᴱˢ*-in-na ap-pa hi.ma hu-ut-tuk-ka₄]* ⊢*[h]a-pi-ra-du-iš hi-še* ⊢*ú-ma-nu-iš*	23
41	[⊢*hal-tàm-ti.ma hu-be.ma.mar tin-gi-ik* § 7 ⏉]ᴿᵁᴴᴹᴱˢ *mar-ri-ip ak-ka₄-be* ⊢ᴴᴬᴿᴹᴱˢ	22½
42	[*hu-ut-taš-da hu-pi-be* ⏉*ia-u-na-ap] ku-ud-da* ⏉*iš-b[a]r-ti-ia-ap* ⏉ᴿᵁᴴᴹᴱˢ	22½
43	*l[a-áš-tuk-ki-ip ak-ka₄-be]* ⊢*la-áš-da hu-ut-taš-da hu-pi-be* ⏉*ma-da-*	21½
44	[*-be ku-ud-da* ⏉*mu-iṣ-ri-ia-ap a-a]k* ⏉ᴿᵁᴴᴹᴱˢ *ak-ka₄-be* ᴳᴵˢ*ma-lu hu-ut-*	22
45	[*-taš-da hu-pi-be* ⏉*iš-bar-ti-i]a-ap ku-ud-da* ⏉*mu-iṣ-ri-ia-ap* ⏉ᴿᵁᴴ	20½
46	[ᴹᴱˢ *ak-ka₄-be* ⊢*ha-ku-r]u-i[š hu-ut-taš-]da hu-pi-be* ⏉*ba-pi-li-ip a-ak* ⏉	22½

TRANSLITERATION—*Continued*

	Number of Sign Units
47 [RUH^{MEŠ} ak-ka₄-be . .-]šu na-a[p-pi-]iš-ti hu-pi-be ⟨ma-da-be ku-ud-da⟨	22 ?
48 [mu-iṣ-ri-ia-ap § 8 a-]ak ⟨da-ri-ia-ma-u-iš ⟨sunku na-an-ri ⊢ šu-šá-an	21½
49 [ir-še-ik-ki p]ir-ra-šá-um [t]e-nu-u[m-d]a-ut-tuk ir-še-ik-ki pír-ra-šá-	21
50 [-um hu-ut-tuk] ⟨ú DINGIRu-]ra-maš-da ⟨ú-un nu-iš-gi-iš-ni ku-ud-da ⟨	21½
51 [mi-iš-da-áš-ba ak-k]a₄ ⟨ú ⟨ad-da-da ku-ud-d[a ⟨d]a-a-ia-u-iš-mi	21½

TRANSLATION

§ 1 [The Great God is] Ahuramazda, who has created this earth, who has created yo[nder firmament], who has created mankind, who has cr[eated] welfare for man, who [has] m[ade] Darius king, [on]e king of many, one l[ord] of many.

§ 2 I am Darius, Great King, king of king[s, king] of pe[op]les, king on this earth, [s]on [of Hystaspes], an Achaemenian.

§ 3 And Dari[us the king sai]th: Ahuramazda the greatest of gods, he created me; he made me king; he [to me] the kingdom [gra]nted which is great, with good horses, with good men.

§ 4 By the grace of Ahuramazda my father [Hystaspes a]nd Arsames my grandfather, [they both were living] when Ahuramazda [made] me king on this [ear]th. And to Ahuramazda [thus the wish was that] on this whole [ear]th [he elected] one man, [me], made me [king] o[n] this earth. [I] rendered [unto Ahuramazda] this [worsh]ip. Ahuramazda bo[re] me aid. [What I] was [comman]ded to do, that he made successful for me. What [I did, that al]l I did by the grace of Ahuramazda.

§ 5 And [this is the palace which] at Susa I erected. Its [m]aterials [have been] b[rought], namely [from afar]. In the depth the earth was dug, until rock-bottom was reached. [When the earth] had thoroughly been dug down, th[en rubb]le was filled up, o[ne pa]rt forty [ells, one part twenty ells] high. [On] that rubble the pal[ace] was erected. A[nd] that the earth has th[oroughly (?)] been dug down, [a]nd that [rubble] has been filled up, and that [unbaked] br[icks have been moulded,] the Babylonian folk, it did [that].

§ 6 And timber, con[iferous (= cedar timber)], this was brought from a mountain named Lebanon; the ⟨As⟩Syrian [folk], it brought it to Babylon, an[d] from [Babylon] Carians and Ionians brought it to [Susa. T]eak (?) from Gandara was brought and fro[m Carmania]. Gold [was brought] from Sa[r]d[i]s and [from] Bactria, which was utilized here. And precious stones— lapis [lazuli and] carnelian (?)—which [were] uti[lized] here, these we[re brought from Sogdiana]. And precious stones—tur[quois (?)]—[this from Ch]or[asmia was bro]ught, which was utilized here. An[d si]lver [and ebony] were brought from [Eg]ypt. And the m[aterial wherew]ith [the wall of the palace (?)] was [pain]ted, that from Ionia was brou[ght. A]nd the iv[ory which was ut]ilized [here], that was brought from Nubia and [from] Sind and from [Ara]chosia. And the sto[ne] pillars [which were utilized here, these were brought from] a place called Abirāduš [in Elam].

§ 7 The men, captives, who [wrought] the stone, [they were Ionians] and Sardians. The men, g[oldsmiths, who] wrought the gold, they were Mede[s and Egyptians. An]d the men who wor[ked] on the wood, [they were Sardia]ns and Egyptians. The men [who worke]d [on the b]aked [bricks], they were Babylonians. And [the men who] adorned [the wal]l, they were Medes and Egyptians].

§ 8 [A]nd Darius the king saith: At Susa [much that is s]plendid was ordered, much that is splendi[d was built]. Me may Ahuramazda protect and [Hystaspes, wh]o is my father, an[d] my [p]eople!

COMMENTARY

Line 1. For an analysis of the Elamite past tense I must refer to my contribution *Elamisches* to Volume II of the *Symbolae Hrozný* (Prague). In my opinion the difference between *pešta* in line 1 and *peša* in line 9 corresponds to the difference between our pluperfect and perfect. The *a*-vowel of the endings may denote the "completed aspect." In the passive voice *maccik* in line 21 might be an aorist in the "continuous aspect," denoted by the *i*-vowel of the ending, while *maccikka* in line 22 represents a perfect or pluperfect in the "completed aspect."

Line 5. The Achaemenian-Elamite pronunciation of the ideogram for "king" was probably *sunku* (or even more correctly *cunku*); "Great King" in *sandhi* writing *cunkuršarra* (cf. F. H. Weissbach, *Die elamische Uebersetzung der Daiwa-Inschrift, Symbolae P. Koschaker* [Leyden, 1939], p. 193). The reconstructed ᵈ*napiršarra* in line 1 = "the (absolutely) Great God" might be a *sandhi* writing, too.

Line 6. The Old Persian word *dahyāuš*, "land," borrowed by the Elamites is placed by them in the personal class (plural ending -*pe*). I, therefore, prefer to render it by "people."

Lines 10/11. On fragment *m* (the so-called "*fragment de barillet*") the two ideograms show a reversed order, viz., RUHᴹᴱˢ comes before ANŠU.KUR.RAᴹᴱˢ. The possessive suffix *e* ("his, its"), however, has been preserved only on this fragment *m*.

Line 13. The reconstruction *ka₄-tuk-be*, "living" (plural), is formed after the singular *ka₄-tuk-ra*, "(a) living (man)," offered by the Daiwa Inscription (XP*h* 45), but remains uncertain.

Line 15. The reconstruction *ha-ni-iš*, "he liked," "it was his wish," is based on the occurrence of this form in Old Elamite texts, since it is not to be found in Achae-menian inscriptions. As regards *kirmaka* "whole," cf. G. G. Cameron, *Persepolis Treasury Tablets* (Chicago, 1949), pp. 38–39.

Line 16. *u-ri-iš-da is an effort to render OP *avar*[*navatā*], "he has chosen for himself." This root was so far known only in the meaning "to believe" (cf. my *Altpersischer Wortschatz* [Leipzig, 1942], p. 149–50), corresponding to Elamite *u-ri-iš*, "believe!" and *u-ri-in-ra*, "a believer." The spelling with *u* (pronounced probably *o*) is striking: with the exception of *ṣa-u-mi-in*, "by the grace," the El. sign *u* occurs exclusively in OP words. Presumably, however, the gap originally contained an Elamite word not yet known to us.

Line 17. The last word in the gap which seems to lack only one character before the mutilated -*m*]*e*, must mean "worship" (Akkadian *i-sin-nu*). In the Daiva Inscription of Xerxes (XP*h* 30 and 34) "worship" is rendered by El. *ši-ib-be*, construed with *hutta-*, "to make," while in our inscription (DS*f* 17) the verb is *tuni*, "I gave." There is scarcely enough space to insert *ši-ib-be*, but a spelling [*šib-b*]*e* would fit very well and solve our problem. Unfortunately, however, the last visible sign seems to be *me*, not *be*. Unless there was a word *šib-me*, "worship," the question as to the correct reconstruction must remain open.

Line 18. The last word in the gap of which the signs -*r*]*u-un-ka₄* are still visible provides us with an example of the long-sought for 1ˢᵗ pers. sing. passive. The OP equivalent of the whole phrase is still missing, but the Akkadian version shows clearly passive construction. The El. word under discussion must have been either [*ti-r*]*u-un-ka₄* or [*tur-r*]*u-un-ka₄*, both of which would be pronounced in the same

way, viz., *tirunka*. The passive voice seems to be characterized by the *u*-vowel before the personal ending (-*ka* in the "completed aspect," -*ki* in the "continuous aspect" ?). When F. H. Weissbach studied the El. version of the Daiva Inscription, he wanted in § 4 a similar passive form in the phrase: [*sa-ap ap-pa* ⸢*ú*] ⸢*sunku hu-ud-du-* . . . —"when I had been made king." My reconstruction would now accordingly be *hu-ud-du-[un-ka₄*.][8]

Old Elamite *turunka*, however (cf. F. Bork, *Realenzyklopaedie der Vorgeschichte*, III [1925], p. 78), is not necessarily a passive form, since the root of the verb "to say" was at that time *turu-*, in contradistinction to Achaemenian *tiri-*. A passive translation of *turunka* would by no means fit into the context of the phrase quoted by Bork. Yet there is no doubt as to the passive meaning of our [*tir*]*unka* in line 18, for in the active voice this form would be either *tiri* or *tiriya*.

ú-ṣa-ra-um-mi in the same line evidently renders OP *(h)ucāramaiy*, "successful to me." This OP loan-word is construed with *huttaš*, "he made," in complete agreement with the parallel OP passage of the Behistun inscription (DB IV: 76): *avataiy : A(h)uramazdā [: (h)ucāra]m : kunautuv*—"this to thee Ahuramazda successful may make!" If we may assume that the El. version of DS*f* followed the OP original more closely than did the Akkadian version, I would propose the following restoration of the missing OP text:

19 [.............. : *tyamaiy : fram-*]
20 [*ātam : cartanaiy : ava : (h)ucāramaiy : akunauš : t-*]
—"What I was ordered to do, that He made successful for me."

[8] The gap in line 12 of the Daiva Inscription which F. H. Weissbach in his contribution to *Symbolae Koschaker* failed to reconstruct should in my opinion be restored as follows: ▷—*da-a-ia-ma ak-ka₄-be-na* ⸢*ú* ⸢*sunku-[ir šá-]ni gi-ut*, literally: "the peoples of whom I the king had become."

Line 20. In an article "Elamisch *is-ma-lu*" which is to appear in *Orientalia* (Rome) in the October 1950 issue, I try to show that *teten* originally meant "block." In our line 20 ⊢-[*t*]*e-tin.ni* = *teten.e*—"its *teten*" corresponds to OP *arjanam* and Akk. *simannu* in the meaning "(its) material." With the addition of the determinative ɢɪš for "wood," it denotes in line 26 "wooden blocks" or "beams" = "timber" = OP θ*armiš*.

The obscure ᴋɪ.ᴍɪɴ in line 20, which normally stands for "ditto," seems to me to be a repetition of *teten.e*. On fragment *l*, ᴋɪ.ᴍɪɴ appears in the following context: . . .]-*ma.mar hu-ut* ᴋɪ.ᴍɪɴ[. . . , which cannot be fitted into our text.

Line 21. G. G. Cameron (*op. cit.*, p. 50) proposed to read [*a*]-*ak na-šá-ra.ma*, "and in depth," or similarly. J. Friedrich (*Orientalia*, 1949, p. 26), however, has proved that *šara.ma* alone means "in the depth" (derived from *šara*, "below"). How we can now reconstruct the noun in the genitive case, to which the remaining signs -*ak-na* evidently belong, I am at a loss to say.

pelaka must mean "rock bottom," unless it forms a 3d sing. pass. of the root *pe(p)l-*, "to place (down)" (cf. DB I:69, III:46), meaning "one's self was placed down," i.e., the bottom was reached.

Line 23. The ideogram ᴜʟ.ʜɪ seems to originate from a contraction of the signs for *ul* and *am* to a compound *ulam* = "palace" by omitting the first two horizontal wedges and the next following perpendicular wedge of the sign for *am*.

Line 24. My reconstruction *du-[ru-ma-ak*], "firmly, thoroughly," reiterates El. *tar-ma-ak* of line 22 which transcribes an OP loan-word, viz., *duruva*, but must remain dubious.

Line 25. Elamite -*ha* lengthening *ā* in OP loan-words is several times attested,

e.g., in XP*h* 42, where El. *ir-da-ha-ṣi* transcribes OP *artāca*.

Line 30. [ᴳᴵˢ]*šeššapat* renders the *yakā* wood of the OP version. E. Herzfeld's tentative translation "teak" (*Altpers. Inschr.*, p. 17) appeals to me more than the "mulberry timber" of F. H. Weissbach (*AfO*, VII, 42). In Sanscrit teak is *sāka*.

Line 33. *sinkabruš* is rendered as "cinnabar" by E. Herzfeld (*op. cit.*, p. 303). All scholars agree as to the red color of the stone in question.

Line 34. For OP *axšaina* = "turquois" see my article in *ZDMG*, XCV (1941) 235–36. The question is, however, still open.

Line 36. The first gap in this line contained the El. equivalent of "ebony." J. Duchesne-Guillemin has conclusively shown that OP *asā dāruv*, literally "stone-wood," means "ebony" (cf. *BSOS*, X [1942], 925–27).

In the second gap of line 36 ⊢-[*te-tin*] may be reconstructed with reasonable certainty in view of the two parallel versions. The last visible characters *-u*]*n-na* I consider to be part of the El. transcription of OP *tyanā*, "wherewith." In assuming a spelling [*da-u*]*n-na* for this word, I have proceeded from XP*h* 45/46, where OP *šiyāta* is transcribed in Elamite as *šá-ud-da*. A reconstruction [*ti-ia-u*]*n-na*, however, might equally be possible.

Line 37. To reconstruct the lengthy first gap of this line is a rather difficult matter. According to line 47, the missing El. word for "wall" seems to have consisted of two syllables, viz., $x + šu$. In adding ⊢-UL.HIᴹᴱˢ.*na* "of the palace," I was inspired solely by the length of the gap; the shorter OP and Akk. versions give us no clue in this respect. My reconstruction [*kar-s*]*u-ka₄*, on the other hand, may be regarded as safe, since in the Susa tablets of the pre-Achaemenian epoch this word clearly means "painted," "colored"

(cf. n. 25 to my article "Elamisch *is-ma-lu*").

Line 38. Whether ᴳᴵˢ*ni-hi*ᴹᴱˢ really means "ivory" is doubtful. I was prompted to insert it in the gap on the basis of two arguments. First, in the Susa tablet No. 158 (cf. V. Scheil, *MDP*, Vol. IX [1907]), ᴳᴵˢ*ni-hi*ᴹᴱˢ ranges between gold, myrrh, and incense and is later on specified as a gift from the king of Egypt. Second, in Susa tablet No. 12, there is mentioned a case(?) "of wood and ᴳᴵˢ*ni-hi*ᴹᴱˢ." A tentative translation of our unknown word by "ebony" seems to be out of the question in view of the last-mentioned connection of wood and ᴳᴵˢ*ni-hi*ᴹᴱˢ.

Line 39. The sign *kur* in the word ⊢-*e-ul-kur*, "pillar," must probably be read *lat* (*ellat*).

Line 41. *mar-ri-ip* are evidently "captives," "prisoners" (from the root *marr-* "to seize, to hold"), who worked as forced laborers. This interpretation—instead of Cameron's "artisans"—throws a significant fresh light on the Persepolis treasury tablets.

Line 43. Only the first horizontal stroke of the sign *la* is still visible, but the reconstruction to *laštikkip*, "goldsmiths," appears quite safe in view of the use of this word in the Persepolis treasury tablets (cf. Cameron, *op. cit.*, p. 142).

Line 44. In my above-mentioned article "Elamisch *is-ma-lu*" I adduced sufficient proof to show that ᴳᴵˢ*ma-lu* means simply "wood." The OP equivalent in DS*f* (l. 51) should be reconstructed as [*dār*]*uv*, accordingly. Thus the proposition "ivory" put forward by F. W. König, as well as the translation "inlay" or "overlay" suggested by G. G. Cameron, may now be disregarded.

Line 46. Fragment *f* shows in this line two mutilated characters, (viz., one with three short perpendicular wedges, and a second one, half-visible, with two hori-

zontal wedges, the upper one long, the lower one short), then a gap with space for three signs, followed by -*da hu-p*[*i*]. The gap can be reconstructed with certainty as [*hu-ut-taš*]-*da*, "they have made." F. W. König (*op. cit.*, p. 40, n. *h*), proposed to read the two mutilated characters as *a-kur*-, giving **a-kur*-[*ru-um*] as his reconstruction. But neither is there space for [*ru-um*], nor could such a word be considered to transcribe the Akk. *agurru*, "baked brick," since the Elamite pronunciation of *a-kur-ru-um* would in Achaemenian times have been *aigirrum*. My own reading of the mutilated signs is [*r*]*u-i*[*š*], and I reconstruct the word as [*ha-ku-r*]*u-i*[*š*] (to be pronounced *āguruš*), the probable Elamite loan-word for Akkadian *agurru* (New Persian *āgūr*).

Line 47. Fragment *f* shows the signs *šu*, *na*, and *ap*, followed by a gap with space for two characters and by a mutilated *ti*. On fragment *i*, this *ti* is completely preserved, preceded by *iš*, which is in its turn preceded by a perpendicular final wedge. On fragment *f*, a reading *na-a*[*p-x-*]*iš-ti* is, therefore, established. The missing sign *x* can probably be restored as *pi*. Since, however, *pi* does not end with a perpendicular stroke, we have to assume that on fragment *i* this *pi* was left out altogether, and that the reading was *na-a*[*p*]-*iš-ti* only. We have to consider *napišti* as an Elamitized Old Persian word meaning "they have painted, adorned," corresponding, in line 37 above, to Elamite [*kars*]*uka* "painted."

GÖTTINGEN